

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 44-119 are pending in the present application. Claims 6, 9, 46, 49, 62-99 and 108-119 have been withdrawn in response to a Restriction Requirement. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50-61, and 100-106 have been rejected. The Examiner has indicated claims 100-103, 105 and 107 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 100-103 and 105 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Likewise, claim 107 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowability with respect to claims 100-103, 105, and 107. Claims 1-3, 5, 10, 45, 50, 53, 55, 57, and 101-103 have been amended. Claims 4, 44, 100, and 104-107 have been cancelled. The Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-12, 45, 47, 48, 50-61, and 101-103 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered by this amendment.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the Drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because the reference character "431" has been used to designate both eccentric rotary shaft and shaft supporting bracket, citing page 23 of the Applicants' specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action. The Applicants have amended the Specification to associate reference number 452 to the additional shaft supporting bracket. The Applicants submit that no corrections to the drawings are required. Support for the amendment may be found, e.g., in Figure 19a.

Objections to the Specification

The specification has been objected to on page 11, line 9 where “And a post” should be changed to – A post --. The Applicants have amended the Specification as suggested by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-12, 53, 55-60, and 100-105 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Various informalities have been noted and the rejections are overcome by amendments thereto. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7, 44, 45, 47, 53-58, 60, 61, 104, and 106 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,443,439 issued to Ohshita, citing Figures 1-3, 11, and 22 in support, as well as column 6, lines 50-60.

In addition, claims 8, 48, and 59 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ohshita as applied to claims 1-5, 7, 44, 45, 47, 53-58, 60, 61, and 100-107 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,659,918 to Schiessl. The Examiner states that Ohshita discloses each of the recited elements except for *pulleys and belts with corresponding toothed structures*, for which he relies upon Schiessl as teaching, citing element 28 in support. The Examiner states it would have been obvious to provide Ohshita’s device with toothed belt drives as taught by Schiessl to drive the shafts in a push-pull manner or for manufacturing purposes.

Claims 10-12 and 50-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ohshita as applied to claims 1-5, 7, 44, 45, 47, 53-58, 60, 61, and 100-107 above and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0033203 to Son.

The Examiner relies upon Son for teaching *both ends of an eccentric shaft (120) connected to a pair of concentric shafts (112, 128) having the same center, wherein the concentric shafts are supported by a bracket (130) and wherein the concentric shaft is connected to an eccentric weight (126)*. The Examiner states it would have been obvious to replace the drive and pulley system (Figure 10) of Ohshita's device with two drive systems as taught by Son (Figure 3a) to avoid the use of a pulley system. The Examiner further states that the modified device would perform equally well as the original Ohshita device because the same up-and-down motion would be produced.

As suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action, the Applicants have amended the claims to incorporate the allowable subject matter, as well as addressing the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. Thus, claims 4, 104, and 105 have been cancelled and their features, as well as the features recited in claim 2 prior to this amendment, are incorporated into independent claim 1. The Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over each of the cited references, either alone or in combination. Claims 101 and 103 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

In addition, claim 100 has been cancelled and its features, as well as those recited in claim 1 prior to this amendment, have been incorporated into claim 2. The Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over each of the cited references.

Further, claims 44, 106 and 107 have been cancelled and their features, as well as those recited in claim 1 prior to this amendment, have been incorporated into claim 3. The Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable over each of the cited references.

Claims 5, 7, 8, 10-23, 53, 55, and 57-59 depend from what should be an allowable base claim 1. Claims 101-103 depend from what should be an allowable base claim 2. Claims 45, 47, 48, 50 - 52, 54, 56, 60, and 61 depend from what should be an allowable base claim 3.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-12,

45, 47, 48, 50-61, and 101-103 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Prosecution on the merits is respectfully requested. Consideration and allowance of claims 1-3 and 101-103 are respectfully requested. The foregoing is believed to be fully responsive to this office action.

No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By /Marisa J. Dubuc/
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Customer No. 23413

Date: August 30, 2007
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929